STUDENTS' ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF E-FEEDBACK TYPES: ONLINE TEACHER FEEDBACK (OTF), ONLINE PEER FEEDBACK (OPF), AND AUTOMATED WRITING EVALUATION FEEDBACK (AWE)

Ümit ÖZKANAL[1]

Emine EREN GEZEN[2]

ABSTRACT

This study investigated students' attitudes and perceptions of online teacher feedback (OTF), online peer feedback (OPF), and automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback and their impact on the writing performance of EFL learners. It was conducted over two semesters with freshman ELT students. The progress writing technique was implemented. Data were collected through a questionnaire with 20 open-ended questions administered to the participants, and writing samples were collected at various stages of the writing process and semi-structured interviews with volunteer students. 65 students were involved in the questionnaire and 10 students participated in the interviews. The results showed that the use of OTF, OPF, and AWE feedback positively impacted learners' writing performance in various areas, including grammar, organization, coherence, and vocabulary. Participants reported that they found the e-feedback, especially the one provided by the instructor helpful and that it improved their writing most while the one provided by the peers was not as effective as the others. The study suggests that using written e-feedback from multiple sources can effectively improve EFL learners' writing performance, and that incorporating OTF, OPF, and AWE feedback can be a valuable addition to the traditional writing process.

Keywords: Online education; online teacher feedback; online peer feedback; automated writing evaluation feedback; EFL writing

1 Asst Prof. Dr., Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversity, Eskişehir, Turkey, email: ozkanal@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-2027-1337

2 Research Assisstant Dr., ehir Osmangazi Üniversity, Eskişehir, Turkey, email:emineerengezen@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-1623-3023

ÖĞRENCİLERİN E-GERİBİLDİRİM TÜRLERİNE İLİŞKİN TUTUMLARI VE ALGILARI: ÇEVRİMİÇİ ÖĞRETMEN GERİBİLDİRİMİ (ÇÖG), ÇEVRİMİÇİ AKRAN GERİBİLDİRİMİ (ÇAG) VE OTOMATİK YAZI DEĞERLENDİRME GERİBİLDİRİMİ (OYDG)

ÖZET

Bu araştırma, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin çevrimiçi öğretmen geri bildirimi (OTF), çevrimiçi akran geri bildirimi (OPF) ve otomatik yazı değerlendirme (AWE) geri bildirimine yönelik tutumlarını ve algılarını incelemiş ve bu geri bildirim türlerinin öğrencilerin yazma performansına etkisini araştırmıştır. Araştırma, yeni başlayan ELT öğrencileriyle iki dönem boyunca gerçekleştirilmiş ve ilerleme yazma tekniği uygulanmıştır. Veriler, katılımcılara yöneltilen 20 açık uçlu soru içeren bir anket ile toplanmış ve yazma örnekleri, yazma sürecinin farklı aşamalarında alınmıştır. Ayrıca, gönüllü öğrencilerle yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler gerçekleştirilmiştir. Anket çalışmasına 65 öğrenci katılmış ve görüşmelere 10 öğrenci katılmıştır. Sonuçlar, OTF, OPF ve AWE geri bildiriminin öğrencilerin yazma performansını dil bilgisi, organizasyon, tutarlılık ve kelime dağarcığı gibi çeşitli alanlarda olumlu bir şekilde etkilediğini göstermiştir. Katılımcılar, özellikle öğretmen tarafından sağlanan elektronik geri bildirimin etkili olduğunu ve yazma becerilerini en fazla geliştiren geri bildirim olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Akranlar tarafından sağlanan geri bildirimin diğerlerine göre daha az etkili olduğu ifade edilmiştir. Bu çalışma, yazılı elektronik geri bildirimin farklı kaynaklardan gelmesinin İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin yazma performansını etkili bir şekilde artırabileceğini ve OTF, OPF ve AWE geri bildiriminin geleneksel yazma sürecine değerli bir katkı sağlayabileceğini önermektedir. Sonuçlar aynı zamanda eğitimciler için öğrenci tercihlerinin ve zamanında geri bildirimin önemini vurgulamaktadır. Bu çalışma, yazma eğitimini iyileştirmek ve etkili öğrenme sonuçları elde etmek isteyen eğitimciler ve müfredat tasarımcıları için önemli öneriler sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çevrimiçi eğitim; çevrimiçi öğretmen geribildirimi; çevrimiçi akran geribildirimi; otomatik yazı değerlendirme geribildirimi; İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak yazma

1. INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has led to a significant shift in education, with online learning becoming increasingly popular. This study explores the perspectives of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students regarding diverse online feedback forms and investigates the impact of these electronic feedback types on their English writing proficiency. Freshman EFL students were the focus of the research, and they received feedback on outlines, initial drafts, and final papers. The results demonstrated that all forms of e-feedback, including OTF, OPF, and AWE, positively influenced students' writing abilities across various writing contexts. Participants particularly valued instructors' electronic feedback, recognizing its instrumental role in enhancing their writing skills. While the literature on writing feedback displays differing views, some scholars emphasize the importance of teacher feedback in improving writing, while others express concerns about its effectiveness and clarity. Peer feedback has been valuable in fostering collaborative learning and critical thinking skills, although challenges arise when students question their peers' feedback credibility. The findings underscore the potential advantages of integrating written e-feedback from multiple sources to complement traditional

writing processes, offering promising directions for future pedagogical and language learning approaches.

English in Turkey is still seen as a foreign language, and one can conclude that Turkey has not reached the desired level of English as seen in the English Proficiency Index that ranks it 64th among 111 countries (EPI, 2023). As is known, writing, as one of the productive skills, is a late-appearing skill in learners, and it is claimed that writing is a complex skill that considers some factors like the topic, function of the text, and future readers (Flower & Hayes, 1980). Writing is a complex skill since it requires production and is the last skill developed even in L1. It is a long process in classroom situations, requiring a first, second, even third, and final draft, and is considered a difficult skill that students are reluctant to learn. Normally, students write their first draft, and teachers correct their writing by giving feedback. Over time, the way feedback is given has changed in association with technology. In fact, it can be stated that the only thing that has not changed in writing is giving feedback.

It is expressed that giving feedback encourages students' writing performance (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010). Feedback in writing can be classified in terms of the way it is given as direct or indirect feedback, the mode as written or oral feedback, and the one providing feedback as teacher or peer feedback (Reugg, 2018).

It is known that all kinds of feedback are quite helpful for students' writing performances. Ferris and Hedgcock (1998) state that teacher feedback on the students' writing is crucial and is believed to be the most effective feedback for students. In the studies carried out on teacher feedback, the general opinion is that it is of great importance for the students: In a study, Ferris (1997) found that teacher feedback improved the students' papers. In another study by Muncie (2000), it was expressed that teachers' comments on the work of students were found to be useful to promote learner autonomy and help improve their long-term writing ability. Similarly, it was put forward that even minimal feedback was helpful and provided a platform for the students to do self-revision (Ismail et al., 2008). A different kind of interaction based on feedback may be accepted as teacher-student conferences or talks. It is stated that conferencing provides perfect opportunities to ask the students important questions about their writing processes, and by doing so, they may get better and more usable comments. It is also pointed out that the interaction between teacher and student makes students active participants, and by asking questions and getting prompt answers, they see their pros and cons in writing so that they can improve their writing (O'Malley & Pierce, 1996; Hyland, 2003).

On the other hand, some studies showed that there were some contradictory results as to teacher feedback. It was found that teacher feedback was often accepted as confusing, arbitrary, and inaccessible. For example, a study by Leki (1990) put forward that without the importance of feedback type, there was no evidence that it would help students improve their writing. Some scholars, like Bai (2012) and Zhang (2016), are against teacher feedback, stating that it has a negative effect on students and causes them to rely on their teacher, which hinders their initiative.

Another feedback type is considered as peer feedback when classmates check each other's writing tasks. In this type of feedback, students are supposed to review their classmates' papers, find the problems and mistakes, and recommend some solutions (Topping, 2009; Latifi et al., 2021). Even though some have the belief that teacher feedback on students is more effective (Zhang, 1995; Hyland, 2003; Rollinson, 2005), some other studies show that peer feedback is also an important factor in improving the writing skills of students (Hansen & Liu, 2005; Wihastyanang et al., 2020). Studies carried out on the peer feedback put forward show that peer feedback applied in higher education yields improvements in students' learning, helps them develop critical thinking skills, and increases motivation (Reinholz, 2018; Novakovich, 2016; Fan & Xu, 2020). It is stated that peer feedback may give students a chance to learn from one another in a challenging and collaborative learning environment (Nicol et al., 2014).

As an interesting finding, it may be stated that first language studies provide a more convincing argument in favor of peer response, and the findings of L1 research do not necessarily apply to L2 learners. The reason why L2 studies differ from L1 studies may be explained by the fact that L2 students feel uncertain about the validity of their peers' feedback. (Wu, 2006). However, some studies express that students may be skeptical about the usefulness of peer feedback since they believe not all peers have enough knowledge in terms of language and content to make corrections and give feedback (Kaufman & Schunn, 2011). As is known, writing is accepted as a difficult skill to develop since it involves and requires deep cognitive thinking skills. Even when peer feedback is assisted with proper strategies, students may have difficulties engaging with their cognitive skills during the process of peer feedback, which may result in an unsuccessful writing product or a less desirable writing performance (Latifi et al., 2021; Noroozi et al., 2020). It is also pointed out that this situation occurs when the quality of the feedback given is low (Misiejuk et al., 2021). Based on this, it may be concluded that the characteristics and forms of feedback given by the peers are of high importance in the students' perception of the feedback (Nelson & Schunn, 2009).

With the pandemic at the beginning of 2020, the whole world came face-to-face with online education. The courses delivered in a classical way had to be changed to another version as online courses, although some courses or some parts of the courses were delivered online before. Dudeney & Hockly (2007), for example, assert that the use of technology in teaching writing has been proven to be effective. While a study by Richards (2015) stated that not all teachers agreed on the use of technology in teaching L2, almost all teachers today have an opposing opinion. With online teaching, online feedback giving, which was used before the pandemic to some extent, also came to the agenda. Some studies on the use of online or web-based feedback proved that online feedback was useful for students. For example, in a study discussing the potential of web-based feedback on EFL students' writing quality, Pariyanto (2012) found that web-based feedback was important to improve the quality of the students' writing since the students could have lots of exposure via the web to how good a composition was.

As is known, e-feedback can be delivered in different forms by using various technological tools. Some studies on the use of e-feedback by using technology depict positive results: In a study by Ab Hamid and Romly (2020), it was found that online learning and online feedback saved time and provided more freedom for both students and teachers since the learning environment was not limited to the classroom and students could communicate with their teachers using social media and other technological tools. In a similar study on giving e-feedback via interactive modes by AbuSa'aleek and Shariq (2021), instructors stated that they were content with the e-feedback since e-feedback and using technology in giving feedback broadened their horizons and eased their work. In giving e-feedback, not only e-mail but also a variety of e-tools can be used; studies by Neuman and Kopcha (2019) and Saeed and Al Qunayeer (2020), for example, suggested Google Docs as an effective channel, expressing that it helped teacher-student and student-student interaction. Some other studies on the use of e-feedback by using blogs by Arslan (2013), Wiki and Facebook by Demirbilek (2015), WhatsApp by Susanti and Tarmuji (2016), and Blackboard LMS by Basabrin (2019) all stated constructive results. It can be stated that e-feedback has been accepted as positive by many studies since it is time-saving.

Another type of feedback these days, in accordance with the development of technology and Web 2.0 tools, is automated feedback (AWE), which is generated by artificial intelligence-based software and delivered to students upon completing any written task (Igi-Global, 2023). Studies carried out depict that this new type of feedback, when compared to teacher feedback, can present personalized comments and recommendations that are mainly helpful for corrections of linguistic mistakes (Zhou, 2013; Wei, 2015). Studies comparing peer feedback and automated feedback have not found any important difference in the final drafts of essays but have pointed out that AWE may prompt more effort in terms of enriching the content (Morch et al., 2017). While Zhou (2013) and Yang & Dai (2015) state that with the help of AWE, students can improve their linguistic performance, writing competence, and self-efficacy, some other scholars express that they have found some weaknesses in the automated feedback since it may look mechanical, incorrect, and repetitive, which may lessen students' adoption of this type of feedback (Wei, 2015; Morch et al., 2017). It is also pointed out that more studies should be carried out on the efficacy of AWE, but it should be taken into consideration that this type of feedback has been gaining popularity in L2 writing (Luo & Liu, 2017).

Considering this information provided in the literature, it is essential to understand students' perceptions and preferences concerning e-feedback providers. Thus, this research reveals a spectrum of opinions about these e-feedback types among students. These insights have important implications for educators and curriculum designers, underscoring the importance of considering students' preferences and learning styles when designing effective feedback strategies. Furthermore, the study underscores the importance of feedback in the learning process. Students' positive attitudes towards feedback indicate its perceived value for their learning and growth. Feedback not only assists students in identifying and rectifying errors but also serves as a motivational catalyst to improve their writing skills. This highlights the essential role of feedback in fostering student engagement and enhancing their

writing abilities. Moreover, the study highlights the significance of prompt feedback delivery. This preference for prompt feedback suggests that educators should prioritize timely feedback provision to facilitate effective learning and improvement among students. In line with these aims, answers to the following questions were sought in this study:

1.   What are the attitudes and preferences of freshman EFL students towards different forms of electronic feedback (OTF, OPF, and AWE) in the context of English writing?

2.   What is the impact of different electronic feedback sources (OTF, OPF, and AWE) on the writing performance and improvement of freshman EFL learners?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1.   Participants

The study involved 65 students who completed a questionnaire and 10 students who participated in interviews. All participants were enrolled in the department of Foreign Language Education at a Turkish-medium state university in Turkey. They were aged between 18 and 22 and had an upper-intermediate or advanced level of English proficiency. The students were learning how to write paragraphs and essays in English and were selected from two sections: Writing Skills 1 and 2. The selection process considered their regular attendance in writing lessons, and their participation was voluntary.

To encourage participation, students who provided full answers in the questionnaire and those who took part in follow-up interviews were given extra course credit. The researchers used a criterion and convenient sampling approach to select the student participants, in which the criteria were being a student in the Writing Skills 1 or Writing Skills 2 class and actively participating in the process-writing with full attendance to the course. The research took measures to maintain the confidentiality of the data collected, and no personal information that could identify the participants was requested. To ensure formal consent, the participants were required to sign an Informed Consent Form. The data provided by the participants were stored separately from other information, and pseudonyms were employed to safeguard their identities in both the questionnaire and interview data.

2.2.   Researchers

Two researchers played active roles in the study, serving as a teacher, observer, and interviewer. These researchers are both instructors at the English Language Teaching Department of a public university.

2.3.   Materials

In this study, we employed a questionnaire consisting of 20 open-ended questions to gather students' perspectives, preferences, and experiences regarding the drafting process and specific forms of e-feedback utilized in the instructional sessions. These e-feedback types encompassed OTF, OPF, and AWE. Furthermore, we investigated the influence of these e-feedback approaches on students' writing performance across various dimensions. The questionnaire was developed by the researcher-instructors

and underwent expert evaluation to ensure its validity and appropriateness. Additionally, we used the same set of questions in the interviews, which enabled us to comprehensively explore and comprehend the research findings of the questionnaire. The questionnaire included 20 questions such as the following:

"Is it easy to understand the following e-feedback types?

1.   Teacher's written e-feedback: Yes/No. Why?

2.   Online peer feedback: Yes or No?

3.   Automatic online feedback providers such as Grammarly: Yes/No. Why?"

Another question was:

"What are your opinions about e-feedback that only says "good!", "interesting!" or short words or abbreviations?"

2.4.   Procedure

The current study utilized a qualitative case study approach with the aim of examining and comprehending the beliefs and perceptions of tertiary-level freshman students regarding the drafting and e-feedback process in second language (L2) writing. The intention was to focus on a single case, which was considered crucial for the study's objectives. In line with Creswell's guidelines (2013), a variety of qualitative data sources, including a questionnaire with open-ended questions, interviews, observations, and writing samples, were collected to facilitate a thorough understanding of the topic. This particular case study was conducted within the confines of a bounded system, encompassing a single university's English language department, and the data collection spanned two semesters.

To ensure data triangulation, multiple methods of data collection were employed in this study. In order to gain a deeper understanding of each participant's perceptions and beliefs, in addition to the open-ended questionnaire, semi-structured interviews were also conducted, lasting approximately 30 minutes each. The volunteer interviewees were selected from Writing skills 1 course in section A and section B in the fall term and Writing Skills 2 course in section A and section B at Foreign Language Education Department in a state university in Turkey. The open questionnaire was administered online by using Google Forms, through the end of the semester when they had enough experience to be able to answer the questions. The interviews took place before or after classes at predetermined times in an online environment. The researchers already knew the student participants so that they could establish rapport and ensure their comfort during the interviews.

The questionnaire and the interviews conducted were generally free from any distressing content. The interviews were held on the Zoom platform which offers free online meeting and conference environment. The interviews were recorded with the participants' consent. However, the participants were explicitly informed that if they experienced any discomfort or disturbance due to the questions or for any other reason throughout the study, they had the freedom to withdraw from the study at any time without providing any explanations. It was emphasized that there would be no penalties or inquiries regarding their decision to withdraw. In such circumstances, it was sufficient for them to

inform the interviewer of their intention to leave. Additionally, when the interviews ended, any questions or concerns the participants had regarding the study were addressed and clarified.

2.5.   Data Collection Procedure

In addition to the questionnaire and interviews, other written data, such as student drafts and course materials, was collected to track and verify the participants' progress. These materials were used to corroborate the information obtained from the interviews. After analyzing the interview data, the researchers consulted with the participants to ensure that their interpretations aligned with the participants' views. Furthermore, peer observations were conducted by the instructor participants during writing lessons at least two or three times throughout the semester. These observations involved taking descriptive and reflective notes to provide additional insights into the participants' experiences and progress.

2.6.   Data analysis procedures

A total of sixty-five students participated in the study, providing questionnaire data. Their answers to the questionnaire were collected. Additionally, twenty-four interviews were conducted with students, which were recorded as video on Zoom and later transcribed verbatim. Later, the researchers thoroughly read the transcriptions, making margin notes to create initial codes. The case and its context were described, and categorical units were formed to identify themes and patterns. This same methodology was applied to analyze the answers to the survey's open-ended questions. Next, themes were identified separately for both the questionnaire and interview data. Subsequently, the researchers merged and finalized the themes reached from both sources to develop a comprehensive picture of the case, following Creswell's framework (2013). Finally, after they were initially carried out independently by each researcher, common statements and findings were selected collaboratively to ensure consensus and agreement between the researchers. Furthermore, the observations and field notes were analyzed using the same approach as the transcription analysis described above.

2.7.   Strategies for validating findings; validity and reliability of the study

The "member checking" strategy was employed to ensure the study's validity and credibility. This involved providing participants with the transcriptions of their interviews and study conclusions and asking them to confirm the accuracy of the representations of their statements and interpretations. This process aimed to enhance the credibility of the findings (Creswell, 2013). The principle of "triangulation" was used by incorporating various data sources, such as observation notes, students' written works, questionnaire responses, and interviews to strengthen the reliability and validity of the study (Creswell, 2013). To achieve "inter-coder agreement," each researcher independently conducted transcriptions and analysis procedures. This approach ensured consistency and validation in data interpretation, enhancing inter-rater reliability. The researchers maintained "prolonged engagement and persistent observation in the field" by actively participating throughout the term and serving as observers before conducting interviews. This approach aimed to establish rapport and trust with the participants, increasing the reliability of the data collected (Creswell, 2013).

2.8. Expected outcomes

Active engagement in the drafting process, along with receiving e-feedback from various sources, was anticipated to lead to noticeable enhancements in students' writing skills, encompassing grammar, vocabulary usage, organization, coherence, and overall writing quality.

Students were expected to perceive the drafting and e-feedback activities as significant and beneficial for their English writing development. The incorporation of multiple online feedback sources was predicted to be appreciated by students, providing them with comprehensive insights and suggestions.

The drafting and online feedback processes were projected to augment students' intrinsic motivation for writing, fostering a sense of engagement, empowerment, and confidence in their ability to produce high-quality written work. This heightened intrinsic motivation was expected to have a positive impact on overall writing performance and long-term language learning outcomes.

Students with intrinsic motivation for language learning were hypothesized to value the e-feedback gathered from different sources more significantly compared to those motivated solely by grades or burdened by the task. It was believed that the former group would actively engage with the e-feedback and utilize it more effectively to improve their writing, while the latter group might display less enthusiasm and derive fewer benefits from the feedback provided.

Providing e-feedback encompassing both language aspects (e.g., grammar, vocabulary) and content (e.g., ideas, context, coherence, organization) was deemed crucial for students' writing development. Acknowledging and addressing students' content-related ideas and concerns in the feedback process was expected to reinforce their perception that their thoughts and expressions were valued by the teacher, thereby positively influencing their overall writing performance.

2.9. The Circular Process of Drafting in Paragraph Writing

2.9.1. *Teaching Writing Deductively*

Initially, in each writing class, students were introduced to the theoretical principles underlying the composition of specific types of paragraphs in the fall term and essays in the spring term, such as opinion, cause and effect and more. In addition to essay writing, they were instructed on conducting research and writing research-based essays in the second semester. During this stage, the instructor delivered online lectures explaining the rhetorical structure of each paragraph and/or essay type and the language that is commonly associated with it. Following the initiation stage, students engaged in reading activities to analyze exemplary samples. This allowed them to recognize and understand the content, organization, and language usage present in these samples. This integration of reading and writing demonstrated the interconnectedness of these skills, highlighting how reading can be utilized to familiarize students with the writing conventions and written discourse in English.

2.9.2. *Instructional Activities*

After introducing the theoretical concepts and examining well-written samples, students participated in various instructional activities before commencing the actual writing task. These

activities primarily focused on practicing and assisting students in generating ideas. Once the students had selected their topics, the instructional activities, such as brainstorming and free writing were employed to facilitate students in generating arguments and ideas for their writing. Following the decision-making phase of what to write, students constructed a basic outline to plan the structure and content of their paragraphs and/or essays. Then, they submitted them on the LMS they used in their institution. The ones who needed further help consulted the instructors about their outlines via email or messages through the LMS and got e-feedback on them. For the essay writing, they also asked for feedback on the sources they planned to use in their papers.

2.9.3. *Writing the first draft*

During the first draft writing phase, which was primarily conducted as an individual activity, students made decisions about their ideas and commenced writing their paragraphs or essays. Teacher monitoring played a pivotal role during this stage, with the teacher's role transitioning from that of a lecturer to that of a guide and observer. In addition to monitoring, providing e-feedback was another crucial aspect of the first draft writing process. Both researchers and teachers emphasized the importance of offering patient feedback, irrespective of the circumstances, as a key attribute of a competent writing instructor. The students not only received guidance from teachers but also utilized automated feedback tools for their drafts before submitting their papers.

After submitting their drafts, students were assigned as reviewers for two of their peers, ensuring that each student received e-feedback from at least two classmates while also having a reviewer role themselves. Prior to this, students were presented with an evaluation rubric to understand the grading criteria they needed to focus on. They were also instructed on the additional points, aside from the rubric, that they were supposed to consider while providing e-feedback to their classmates' papers, with an emphasis on being polite. The reviewing task was graded, motivating students extrinsically. Those who failed to review their peers' papers lost points. This process aimed to foster a supportive and engaged writing environment.

2.9.4. *Writing the Final Draft*

After receiving e-feedback from the automated tools, then from the teacher, and from their peers on the first draft, this stage follows. Based on the e-feedback received from different channels, the students revised their drafts, wrote their final papers, and submitted them on the LMS. While it may appear to mark the conclusion of a linear process, it represents a part of a larger cycle wherein the various improvements and flaws within the entire process become evident. In this phase, the students were also evaluated to determine whether they had taken the e-feedback they had received previously into account. The students got feedback on the final paper as well. Based on the reports of most of the students, the drafting process helped them develop an awareness of the writing process and enhanced the content and organization of their writing.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents the themes and categories that emerged in the interviews and the questionnaire as the investigation findings conducted in this research. Based on the responses given in the questionnaire and interviews, it seems that students have different opinions about different e-feedback types provided by their instructor, peers, and automatic online feedback providers. They used e-feedback from different sources in different ways and at different times. Based on the findings, the following themes emerged:

3.1. Drafting versus Writing:

The preferences for recasting or drafting versus writing a new paragraph or essay vary greatly among individuals. Some participants found drafting helpful and prefer to write drafts before starting an essay or paragraph. For instance, participant #8 said "In my opinion, with this method, we can see the first sight of our writing, and then we can change it to a better one.". On the other hand, others preferred to just write new paragraphs or essays without drafting. For example, Participant #24 said, "I do not usually need drafts; I can write without them, but for some people they could be useful."

Moreover, some responses suggested that drafting can help organize thoughts, select ideas, and improve grammar and spelling mistakes. Participant #11 stated, "I like writing drafts because I am the kind of person who has a lot of opinions in a very messy way, so drafting helps me express myself more in an organized way." Others believe that drafting can be tedious and time-consuming and prefer to start writing right away. For instance, Participant #20 stated this by saying "Though it [drafting] might help some people, I find it distracting". A few respondents, however, did not find this method useful, while others preferred freewriting or outlining. Overall, it seems that writing drafts during classes could be an effective way to improve writing skills, but individual preferences and learning styles should also be considered. Thus, the decision to use drafting or recasting or not seems to depend on personal preference, the complexity of the topic, and the writer's skill level.

As evidenced by the results, it was seen that certain students exhibit a preference for engaging in the process of recasting and drafting when writing, as they find value in receiving error correction. Conversely, there exists a group of students who do not share this preference and instead opt to commence writing without engaging in recasting and drafting. Advocates of recasting and drafting argue that these practices facilitate the organization of concepts and enhance grammatical accuracy, hence aiding in the improvement of writing quality. According to Sheen's (2010) study, it was shown that students who received written correction criticism and expressed a preference for recasting or drafting had better performance in their writing compared to those who did not receive such input. Hence, it can be inferred that there exists a degree of similarity between the outcomes of this research and the study conducted by Sheen (2010). Once more, a study conducted by Doughty and Varela (1998) proposed that learners who were exposed to deliberate corrective recasting had enhancements in their writing abilities. This finding exhibits a similar pattern to our study as well as previous studies that have been referenced.

3.2. Grades vs. Feedback: Which is More Important for Students?

The participants' opinions regarding their interest in scores and feedback varied, with some valuing both aspects equally, while others prioritized one over the other. However, many responses indicated a higher interest and motivation towards feedback. Feedback was perceived as more valuable as it allowed participants to correct mistakes and enhance their skills for future endeavors. For instance, Participant #1 said, "Feedback is more interesting because I can correct my mistake [by getting feedback] and get a higher score." Some also mentioned that grades were important for their academic progress, but feedback was crucial to their learning and growth. For example, Participant #21 stated, "Well, both! Grades are important, of course, but passing on improvement will only make it harder for one to get better grades. Feedback makes it easier to get better grades. But if I must give only one answer, it's feedback." In line with the findings, Armstrong (2010) stated that the influence of grades on student writing was found to be minimal, suggesting that incorporating more frequent and diverse ungraded writing assignments could serve as an effective pedagogical strategy to enhance both the structure and substance of students' written work. It is important to acknowledge the interconnected nature of grades and feedback, whereby feedback plays a crucial role in enhancing grades, and grades, in turn, serve as an indicator of the efficacy of the feedback provided. Consequently, both grades and feedback hold significant importance as integral elements of the learning process. As such, students should actively endeavor to seek and incorporate feedback to enhance their skills and academic performance, thereby leading to improved grades.

3.3. Willingness to use Online Feedback Providers:

Many respondents seemed willing to use automatic online feedback providers again in the future. Many respondents appreciated the convenience of using such platforms and found them helpful in detecting errors and improving their writing. For instance, Participant #4 said, "Yes, I am willing to use them again. They can see the mistakes that I couldn't see sometimes." Some respondents expressed a preference for face-to-face feedback from a teacher or peer, while others mentioned concerns about the reliability or effectiveness of online feedback providers. Participant #2 stated this by saying, "No matter how advanced, sometimes it cannot see and correct my mistakes because it is automatic." Also, Participant #12 stated that "These kinds of applications like Grammarly can make us write carelessly if we rely on them, thinking these applications will somehow correct our mistakes.".

Previous research conducted on the subject matter demonstrates similarities with the conclusions presented in this study. According to a study conducted by Li et al. (2015) in a classroom setting, students expressed their contentment with the corrected feedback provided by AWE (Automated Writing Evaluation) in relation to grammar and mechanics. However, they contended that more significant issues, such as organization and rhetorical techniques, still necessitated the guidance and support of the teacher. A further research investigation examining the combined use of Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) systems and teacher feedback revealed that students exhibited a strong inclination towards AWE-based programs. However, they encountered challenges in comprehending

the feedback provided by the AWE system due to their limited familiarity with it (Mohsen & Abdulaziz, 2019). According to Cheng (2017), the findings of the study indicate that students exhibited favorable views towards the prompt feedback provided by AWE on numerous submissions.

3.4. Preferences and Satisfaction with E-Feedback Providers: Students' Opinions

The data shows that the preferences for and satisfaction level with different types of e-feedback providers vary among the students.

3.4.1. Teacher Feedback

Students found electronic teacher feedback to be more detailed and helpful than peer e-feedback or feedback from automatic online providers. Overall, participants expressed that the teacher's written e-feedback held the highest value among various feedback types. This preference was attributed to its comprehensive nature, personalized approach, and customized alignment with the individual student's requirements. Teachers were considered professionals in their field and had a better understanding of their students' abilities. In a similar vein, the research conducted by Benson and DeKeyser (2019) demonstrated that American ESL learners had various advantages when exposed to direct or metalinguistic remedial feedback from their instructors. Various linguistic and affective factors have been documented to influence the level of learner engagement with teacher feedback. These factors include learner attitude and beliefs (Han, 2017), emotional responses (Mahfoodh, 2017), and the explicitness of the feedback provided (Suzuki, Nassaji, & Sato, 2019). According to Tehrani's (2018) research, a significant number of students perceive written commentary from educators as the most efficacious approach for enhancing the caliber of their writing. This preference for teacher feedback likely stems from the students' perception that their teachers possess greater expertise in the subject matter.

3.4.2. Online Peer Feedback

Some participants considered online peer feedback to be beneficial, as it offered a broad perspective from peers within their age group. For instance, Participant #27 acknowledged that it aided in identifying vocabulary and spelling errors by saying "It helped me see my vocabulary and spelling mistakes.". Nonetheless, other participants held a less favorable view, citing concerns that peers might lack the expertise of teachers and could potentially deliver criticism that may offend students. In some instances, students reported not receiving any peer feedback, or when they did, peers were overly lenient in their evaluations. Consequently, online peer feedback is often preferred for informal writing tasks or journaling but may not consistently provide significant support. Participant #5 stated, "Not at all because I did not get any useful feedback from my peers," while Participant #24 asserted, "Online peers are not as skilled as a teacher, so I think they would be incompetent at giving feedback."

Peer feedback has been recognized in previous research as having the potential to improve students' writing proficiency (Huisman, Saab, van Driel, & van den Broek, 2018; Noroozi & Hatami, 2019). Nevertheless, concerns have been raised about the effectiveness of peer feedback due to students' limited knowledge, experience, and language proficiency (Noroozi et al., 2018; Saito & Fujita, 2004).

Similarly, a study involving master's students and their engagement with peer feedback in academic writing revealed diverse sentiments and perspectives. Their cognitive and behavioral involvement appeared to be superficial (Yu et al., 2019). In another study by Fan and Xu (2020), a minority of students expressed disappointment with peer evaluation due to their group members' limited feedback contributions, attributed to either inadequate skill or a perfunctory approach.

3.4.3. Automatic Online Feedback Providers

Automated online feedback providers were commonly utilized by students to identify errors and receive prompt, accurate feedback before submitting assignments. However, there were some students who had not previously used such providers. Nevertheless, most participants viewed automated online feedback as beneficial, attributing its usefulness to the instant feedback it offered and its capacity to aid students in comprehending their mistakes. For instance, Participant #12 asserted, "It assists me with punctuation, overused vocabulary, content, sentence coherence, and organization. I cannot say the same for the rest of them, as the free account only addresses the aspects I mentioned." Additionally, Participant #61 stated, "Yes. When I make mistakes, Grammarly instantly corrects my punctuation mistakes. Moreover, Grammarly also helps me correct my grammar mistakes. Grammarly suggests new words for my writing and helps me organize my thoughts about the content I write. In the end, my essay has coherence and unity thanks to Grammarly."

Consistent with the research, empirical investigations have demonstrated that automated feedback, in contrast to teacher feedback, has the capacity to offer individualized comments and suggestions, hence proving more advantageous in rectifying linguistic faults (Zhou, 2013; Wei, 2015). Studies comparing automated feedback and peer feedback have found that there is no substantial difference in their impact on the final grades of essays. However, it has been observed that automated feedback has the potential to stimulate greater effort in enhancing the content of the essays (Morch et al., 2017). Moreover, automated feedback has been shown to enhance students' language proficiency, writing abilities, and self-assurance (Zhou, 2013; Yang & Dai, 2015). This positive perception of automated feedback aligns with findings from a quasi-experimental study conducted by Wang et al. (2013), which reported that the feedback offered was clear and easily understood. The research revealed that following the utilization of the AWE tool, CorrectEnglish, the experimental group exhibited superior performance compared to the control group in the areas of grammar, word usage, and spelling.

3.4.4. Diverse Use of Feedback

Students' preferences for feedback types exhibited variability. Generally, teacher feedback held a high level of importance, followed by automated online feedback. While peer feedback proved valuable for informal writing activities and idea generation, it may not suffice for comprehensive revisions. Some students advocated for a combined approach, utilizing various e-feedback providers in writing classes. For instance, Participant #13 expressed, "I am pretty sure the best way is getting e-feedback from teachers. I had many, and I think I am satisfied with that always and improved myself more with getting an e-feedback from teachers." Likewise, Participant #14 stated, "Every one of them is important for me. The teacher has knowledge; peers can see things the teacher cannot see. And the applications have much more access to certain things."

Although students acknowledged the value of teacher feedback, there were concerns raised regarding the potential workload burden on teachers. Some participants suggested that teachers should train students to provide more honest and constructive peer feedback, avoiding undue positivity or sugar-coating. For example, Participant #15 remarked, "We only wrote about what we thought about the essay (topic, body, etc.), and we encouraged each other. We did not focus on the mistakes, if there were any. It turned into a section of 'showing love,' in my opinion." Additionally, Participant #11 expressed, "I had the most awful comments about my writings, and they weren't even negative. It was too much positivity—a lot of bursts of sunshine, rainbows, and unicorns. I didn't even notice any of my mistakes." While students also valued online peer feedback, they emphasized the need for peers to be more objective and invest additional time in providing feedback. Participant #43 explained, "They were helpful, but they did not provide all of the aspects above. They only write what they see; they do not write it with all the details." Financial concerns regarding premium versions of automated online feedback providers were also mentioned by some students. For instance, Participant #2 mentioned, "It has a premium feature that isn't free. And it doesn't show all of my mistakes." In summary, students generally appreciated the different e-feedback providers in writing classes, but there were notable suggestions for improvement, including the promotion of greater objectivity in peer feedback and consideration of the affordability of premium versions of automated online feedback providers.

All in all, students exhibited diverse preferences for the various e-feedback channels provided. Many students expressed contentment with the teacher's written e-feedback and automated online feedback providers. However, some students encountered challenges in understanding the feedback or found it to be of limited usefulness. Conversely, the satisfaction level with online peer feedback was comparatively low, with students frequently noting the absence of valuable feedback from their peers or perceiving it as lacking in sensibility. Additionally, certain students underscored the significance of receiving comprehensive and specific feedback from their teachers. Moreover, some students valued the professional nature of the feedback offered by their teachers, viewing both online and teacher feedback as more professionally valuable than peer feedback. In summary, the data indicates that students' viewpoints regarding the efficacy of e-feedback providers differ, and their level of satisfaction is influenced by factors such as the comprehensiveness, specificity, usefulness, and professionalism of the feedback they receive.

3.5. Timing of Written E-Feedback:

The data suggests that the respondents held varying preferences regarding the timing of receiving written e-feedback. Some desired it before exams, others after submitting their homework, and some preferred it immediately after completing a paragraph or essay. For example, Participant #3 expressed, "Before I send my homework, I want to fix it and submit an accurate assignment." Moreover, there were participants who sought prompt feedback within two to three days or within a week. Certain respondents mentioned their preference for receiving written e-feedback when they made mistakes, lacked certainty, or needed external input. On the other hand, some individuals showed indifference towards e-feedback

or its timing. Overall, the timing for written e-feedback appeared to be contingent upon individual needs and preferences.

Consistent with prior research, it is evident that the outcomes derived from these studies exhibit a high degree of similarity. As evidenced by a recent study by Lefevre and Cox (2017), learners prefer receiving rapid feedback as opposed to delayed input when given the opportunity. According to a study conducted by Marczak, Krajka, and Malec (2016), the primary advantage of e-learning feedback, as reported by the majority of participants, is the provision of immediate feedback. According to Lee's (2013) research, it was shown that the students had a high inclination towards agreeing that their faults would be explicitly and promptly rectified.

3.6.   Comparison of Traditional Written, Online, and Oral Feedback:

Additionally, in terms of the comparison of traditional versus online feedback providers, most students preferred written e-feedback because of its convenience and accessibility. For instance, Participant #2 asserted, "I prefer written e-feedback. Because it can be more helpful in online education, and I can look at it whenever I want". Also, Participant #12 stated, "I think traditional feedback is a bit more convenient considering my teacher's time, and I am a shy person, so face-to-face meetings make me more defensive, which is pointless and too sensitive." However, there were still students who favored oral feedback, particularly for more significant and crucial assignments, as they perceived it to be more effective in directly addressing their mistakes. Participant #5 remarked, "In my opinion, online or traditional written feedback is mostly the same. Oral feedback could be useful for bigger and more vital assignments." Furthermore, Participant #10 expressed, "I think oral feedback is better because I remember better when I hear my mistakes, and I have to not make them again out loud." They can access online feedback anytime they want, and it can be more helpful in online education. Participant #12 stated, "I prefer the digital one because I can open and browse this feedback whenever I want. I have never tried oral feedback, but I think it is quite catchy."

As stated above, some students preferred traditional written feedback. Similarly, according to a comprehensive analysis conducted by Lim and Renandya (2020), which included 35 studies on written feedback in writing, most of the findings suggested beneficial benefits of written corrected feedback. However, a small number of studies reported contrasting results, as shown by a negative sign. However, some students preferred oral feedback, especially for bigger and more vital assignments, because they found hearing their mistakes directly from their teachers more effective. In a study conducted by Sobhani and Tayebipour (2015), it was shown that oral feedback had a greater impact on the essay writing skills of Iranian learners compared to the other two types of feedback. It is recommended that learners properly prioritize the feedback they receive from their teacher. The potential cause may also be attributed to the superior aural orientation of learners in processing feedback compared to their visual focus while getting corrective feedback from the teacher. The students showed a greater degree of attentiveness towards the spoken instructions provided by the teacher as opposed to the textual annotations made on their essays. Furthermore, according to Grigoryan's (2017) study, it was proposed that the most successful method of providing feedback in composition pedagogy is through one-on-one student-instructor conferences.

This approach aligns with a constructivist perspective on learning, which views the learning process as a dialogue. Maliborska and You (2016) conducted a study that examined the satisfaction levels of first-year foreign composition students with conferencing. The findings indicated that the students reported a notable degree of satisfaction with conferencing due to its positive impact on student motivation, comprehension of instructors' feedback, and provision of personalized assistance. According to Trotman (2011), in the context of a higher education preparatory English for academic purposes (EAP) writing course in Turkey, the practice of student-teacher conferencing was regarded as being "mutually appreciated and highly valued" (p. 15) by both the students and teachers involved.

Nevertheless, some students had no specific preference and were open to any feedback platform. Hence, students' preferences may vary based on their learning style, personality, and the specific task or assignment being assessed. In summary, it is crucial to acknowledge that students' preferences can differ depending on their learning style, personality, and the nature of the evaluated task.

3.7.   Understanding Different Feedback Types Received: Participants' Experiences

Based on the responses received, it appears that many participants found the teacher's written e-feedback and automatic online feedback providers to be easily understandable. Participant #35 stated, "The most optimal method for writing lessons is evaluated by the teacher of the essays. Because the teacher explains more clearly and accurately." The rationale behind this perception lies in the clear and detailed nature of the teacher's feedback, which includes explanatory elements. Similarly, automated online feedback providers were valued for their ability to pinpoint errors precisely and provide corrective guidance. Participant #34 remarked, "Essays are being evaluated only by online feedback providers such as Grammarly. Because using this application is fast, and you can use it very easily." In contrast, some participants encountered difficulty comprehending online peer feedback. Participant #4 mentioned, "It's easy to understand the teacher's feedback since what our teacher demands is clear. Peer feedback can be a little confusing sometimes." This discrepancy arose due to the inconsistent usefulness and occasionally ambiguous or poorly articulated nature of peer feedback. In general, it seems that the ease of understanding feedback types depends on the quality of the feedback received and the clarity of the feedback provider's communication.

3.8.   The Impact of E-Feedback Length (detailed or short feedback) on Students' Writing: Students' Opinions

The opinions about short or superficial e-feedback were diverse. Some considered such feedback inadequate, unhelpful, and lacking in any constructive value, as it failed to identify errors or offer opportunities for improvement. For instance, Participant #18 stated, "If there is no mistake, it does not matter to me. You can say 'good' to me. But if you can see any mistake, you should say that, and you should check my entire assignment. Feedback in more detail is always better." On the other hand, some found them beneficial, morale-boosting, and comprehensive enough, as they give motivation and could be a chance to make up. However, most students favored detailed e-feedback that was inspiring, specific, clear, and furnished helpful information or criticism to enhance their current and future writing. For example, Participant #30 remarked, "I don't like it. I prefer to receive critical feedback on mistakes I have made."

3.9. Willingness to Use Online Feedback Providers in the Future: Students' Attitudes

The responses to the question regarding the participants' willingness to utilize online feedback providers again in the future, if given the chance, were diverse; however, most respondents expressed their readiness to do so. Many participants acknowledged the convenience of using such platforms and recognized their efficacy in identifying errors and enhancing their writing. For example, Participant #1 asserted, "Yes, because no matter how good I am, there will always be something wrong, so it's worth checking." While some respondents preferred face-to-face feedback from teachers or peers, others raised concerns about the dependability or effectiveness of online feedback providers. Participant #21 expressed, "No, I would prefer feedback from my teacher if possible." Overall, it appears that the majority of respondents are open to utilizing online feedback providers again in the future, though some may opt for alternative forms of feedback.

The potential motivation for students to utilize these resources in the future may be associated with the discoveries presented in the subsequent research investigations. For instance, Faizi (2018) discovered that these technologies have facilitated the process of generating and disseminating texts, thereby presenting significant prospects for collaborative and interactive learning. Students can actively participate in constructing knowledge by sharing their work with a broader audience, taking charge of their own learning, and enhancing previously gained information through critical reflection. The research conducted by Noroozi and Hatami (2019) and Wu (2019) suggests that electronic peer feedback (e-PF) offers advantages over traditional face-to-face and paper-based feedback methods. Specifically, e-PF not only enhances argumentative interaction but also enhances the validity and trustworthiness of peer feedback.

4. CONCLUSION

To conclude, this study has offered insights into students' opinions and attitudes towards various e-feedback providers, the timing of feedback delivery, the impact of feedback styles on their writing, and so on. The findings underscore the significance of digital feedback in the learning process and highlight the importance of considering students' preferences and individual differences when designing effective feedback strategies. As educational institutions continue to embrace digital tools and online learning platforms, understanding students' perceptions of e-feedback becomes increasingly crucial for enhancing writing instruction and promoting effective learning outcomes. By addressing the implications of this study and exploring the suggested future research directions, educators can better support their students' writing development and foster a culture of continuous improvement through meaningful and timely feedback.

4.1. Limitations

The present study is subject to several constraints. Firstly, the relatively small sample size of 65 participants from a single Turkish university raises concerns about the generalizability of the findings beyond this specific context. Also, the study primarily focuses on short-term outcomes and perceptions,

lacking longitudinal data necessary for assessing the long-term effects of the interventions. Furthermore, the absence of a control group hinders the ability to attribute observed improvements exclusively to the use of e-feedback. Assumptions about students' technology access and familiarity overlook potential variations in digital literacy among participants. Despite offering valuable insights, addressing these limitations in future research is essential to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the efficacy of e-feedback in diverse educational environments.

4.2.   Future Directions for Research

Drawing from the results, implications of this study, and limitations, several promising avenues for future research can be pursued. First, further research could delve into exploring the influence of individual differences, such as learning styles, personality traits, and language proficiency levels, on students' preferences for different feedback sources. A deeper understanding of how these individual factors interact with feedback preferences can inform the development of more personalized and effective feedback approaches. Next, future studies may undertake a comparative analysis of the effectiveness of diverse feedback styles, such as written feedback, oral feedback, and multimedia feedback, on students' writing improvement. An examination of how various feedback formats affect student learning outcomes can enrich the development of comprehensive and well-rounded feedback strategies. Furthermore, these may be observed in longitudinal studies to see how their opinions of e-feedback providers evolve over time and how it affects their writing skills to develop fruitful writing instruction. Thus, in addition to the above-mentioned study, researchers may also investigate the impact of instructor training on providing constructive and effective feedback to students to enhance the quality and usefulness of feedback provided to students.

REFERENCES

Ab Hamid, H., & Romly, R. (2020). Teachers' perception on giving feedback to students' online writing assignment during movement control order (MCO). *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Science, Technology, Engineering and Industrial Revolution (ICSTEIR 2020),* 536, 461-463. http://dx.doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210312.076

AbuSa'aleek, A. O., & Shariq, M. (2021). Innovative practices in instructor e-feedback: A case study of e- feedback given in three linguistic courses during the COVID 19 pandemic. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Covid 19 Challenges*, (1), 183-198. https://dx.doi.org/10 .24093/awej/covid.14

Armstrong, K. (2010). Fluency, Accuracy, and Complexity in Graded and Ungraded Writing. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43, 690-702. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1944-9720.2010.01109.X.

Arslan, R. S. (2013). Integrating feedback into prospective English language teachers' writing process via blogs and portfolios. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 13(1), 131-150.

Bai, L. R. (2012). Validation of Peer Feedback Pattern Inventory for College English Writing. *Modern Foreign Languages*, 35, 184-192.

Basabrin, A. (2019). Exploring EFL instructors' and students' perceptions of written corrective feedback on Blackboard platform: A case study. *Arab World English Journal, Special Issue 1: Application of Global ELT Practices in Saudi Arabia*, 179-192.

Benson, S., & DeKeyser, R. (2019). Effects of written corrective feedback and language aptitude on verb tense accuracy. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(6), 702-726.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the Linguistic Accuracy Level of Advanced L2 Writers with Written Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 204-217. doi: 10.1016/j. jslw.2010.10.002

Cheng, G. (2017). The impact of online automated feedback on students' reflective journal writing in an EFL course. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 34, 18–27.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Sage Publications.

Demirbilek, M. (2015). Social media and peer feedback: What do students really think about using Wiki and Facebook as platforms for peer feedback? *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 16(3), 211-224.

Doughty, C. & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In *C. Doughty & J. Williams, (Eds.) ,Focus on form in classroom SLA*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dudeney, G, & Hockly, N. (2007). *How to Teach English with Technology*. Essex: Pearson Education.

Faizi, R. (2018). Teachers' perceptions towards using Web 2.0 in language learning and teaching. *Education and Information Technologies*, 23(3), 1219-1230.

Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 50, 100775.

Ferris, D. R. (1997). The Influence of Teacher Commentary on Student Revision. *TESOL Quarterly,* 31 (2), 315-339. doi: 10.2307/3588049

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. S. (1998). *Teaching ESL Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints. *Cognitive Processes in Writing*, 31-50.

Grigoryan, A. (2017). Audiovisual commentary as a way to reduce transactional distance and increase teaching presence in online writing instruction: Student perceptions and preferences. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 3(1), 83–128.

Han, Y. (2017) Mediating and being mediated: Learner beliefs and learner engagement with written corrective feedback. *System*, 69 (2017), pp. 133-142

Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). *Guiding principles for effective peer response*. ELT Journal, 59(1), 31-38.

Huisman, B., Saab, N., van Driel, J., & van den Broek, P. (2018). Peer feedback on academic writing: Undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43, 955–968.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Igi-global. (2023). *Automated feedback*. Retrieved from https://www.igi-global.com/dictionary/automated-feedback/50921

Ismail, N., Maulan, S., & Hasan, N. H. (2008). The Impact of Teacher Feedback on ESL Students' Writing Performance. *Academic Journal of Social Studies*, 8(1), 45-54.

Kaufman, J., and C. Schunn. 2011. "Students' Perceptions About Peer Assessment for Writing: Their Origin and Impact on Revision Work." *Instructional Science* 39 (3): 387–406. doi:10.1007/s11251-010-9133-6.

Latifi, S., Noroozi, O., & Talaee, E. (2021). Peer feedback or peer feedforward? Enhancing students' argumentative peer learning processes and outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(2), 768–784.

Lee, E. J. E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*,41(2), 217–230.

Lefevre, D., & Cox, B. (2017). Delayed instructional feedback may be more effective, butis this contrary to learner's preferences? *British Journal of Educational Technology*,48(6), 1357–1367.

Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. . In *B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*, 57-68. Cambridge University Press.

Li, J., Link, S., & Hegelheimer, V. (2015). Rethinking the role of automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback in ESL writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 1–18.

Lim, S. C., Renandya, W. A. (2020). Efficacy of written corrective feedback in writing instruction: a meta-analysis. *TESL-EJ*, 24(3).

Luo, Y. and Liu, Y. (2017) Comparison between Peer Feedback and Automated Feedback in College English Writing: A Case Study. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 7, 197-215.

Mahfoodh, O.H.A. (2017) "I feel disappointed": EFL university students' emotional responses towards teacher written feedback. *Assessing Writing*, 31 (2017), pp. 53-72.

Maliborska, V., & You, Y. (2016). Writing conferences in a second language writing classroom: Instructor and student perspectives. *TESOL Journal*, *7*(4), 874-897.

Marczak, M., Krajka, J., & Malec, W. (2016). Web-based assessment and language teachers from Moodle to WebClass. *International Journal of Continuing Engineering Education and Life-Long Learning*, 26(1), 44–59.

Mohsen, M. A., & Abdulaziz, A. (2019). Effectiveness of using a hybrid mode of automated writing evaluation system on EFL students' writing. *Teaching English with Technology*, 19(1), 118–131.

Morch, A. I., Engeness, I., Cheng, V. C., Cheung, W. K., & Wong, K. C. (2017). EssayCritic: Writing to Learn with a Knowledge-Based Design Critiquing System. *Educational Technology & Society*, 20, 213-223.

Muncie, J. (2000). Using Written Teacher Feedback in EFL Composition Classes. *ELT Journal,* 54(1), 4753. doi: 10.1093/elt/54.1.47

Neumann, K. L., & Kopcha, T. J. (2019). Using Google Docs for peer-then-teacher review on middle school students' writing. *Computers and Composition*, 54, 1-16.

Nelson, M. M., & Schunn, C. D. (2009). The nature of feedback: How different types of peer feedback affect writing performance. *Instructional Science*, 37(4), 375–401.

Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2014). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: a peer review perspective. *Assessment & evaluation in higher education*, *39*(1), 102-122.

Noroozi, O., & Hatami, J. (2019). The effects of online peer feedback and epistemic beliefs on students' argumentation-based learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International,* 56, 548–557.

Noroozi, O., Hatami, J., Bayat, A., van Ginkel, S., Biemans, H. J., & Mulder, M. (2020). Students' online argumentative peer feedback, essay writing, and content learning: Does gender matter? *Interactive Learning Environments*, 28(6), 698–712.

O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). *Authentic Assessment for English Language Students: Practical Approaches for Teachers.* New York: Addison-Wesley.

Pariyanto. (2012). The Use of Web-based Feedback on ESL Students' Writing Quality. *Proceedings of the 59th TEFLIN International Conference: English Language Learning and Teaching in the Digitization Era*. Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, 6-8 November 2012.

Reinholz, D. L. (2018). Three approaches to focusing peer feedback. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* 12(2), 1–8.

Reugg, R. (2018). Providing effective feedback on L2 academic writing. *RumelidE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (13), 161-178.

Richards, J. C. (2015). Technology in Language Teaching Today. *Indonesia Journal of English Language Teaching,* 10(1), 18-32.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30. doi: 10.1093/elt/cci003

Saeed, M. A., & Al Qunayeer, H. S. (2020). Exploring teacher interactive e-feedback on students' writing through Google Docs: factors promoting interactivity and potential for learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2020.1786711

Saito, H., & Fujita, T. (2004). Characteristics and user acceptance of peer rating in EFL writing classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, 31-54.

Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *32*(2), 203-234.

Sobhani, M., & Tayebipour, F. (2015). The effects of oral vs. written corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' essay writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5*(8), 1601.

Susanti, A., & Tarmuji, A. (2016). Techniques of optimizing WhatsApp as an instructional tool for teaching EFL writing in Indonesian senior high schools. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 4(10), 26-31.

Tehrani, F. A. (2018). Feedback for writing or writing for feedback. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(4), 162-178.

Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer assessment. *Theory Into Practice*, 48(1), 20–27.

Trotman, W. (2011). Action research on feedback on EAP writing: Teacher-student oral conferencing in a higher education context in Turkey. *English Language Teacher Education & Development,* 14, 15-23.

Wang, Y. J., Shang, H. F., & Briody, P. (2013). Exploring the impact of using automated writing evaluation in English as a foreign language university students' writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *26*(3), 234-257.

Wei, M. (2015). An Empirical Study into Effects of Feedback on College English Writing. *Journal of Tianjin Foreign Studies University*, 22, 43-50.

Wihastyanang, W. D., Kusumaningrum, S.R., Latief., A., Cahyono., B. Y. (2020). Impacts Of Providing Online Teacher And Peer Feedback On Students' Writing Performance. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE* Volume: 21 Number: 2

Wu, W.S. (2006). The effect of blog peer review and teacher feedback on the revisions of EFL writers. *Journal of Education and Foreign Languages and Literature*, p.125-139.

Wu, Z. (2019). Lower English proficiency means poorer feedback performance? A mixed-methods study. *Assessing Writing*, 41, 14-24.

Yang, X. Q., & Dai, Y. C. (2015). Practice Research on Self-Regulated Writing Model of College English Teaching Based on Pigai Network. *Computer-Assisted Foreign Language Education*, 2, 17-23.

Yu, S., Zhang, Y., Zheng, Y., Yuan, K., & Zhang, L. (2019). Understanding student engagement with peer feedback on master's theses: A Macau study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *44*(1), 50-65.

Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4, 209-222.

Zhang, W. L. (2016). A Peer Response Writing Activity for College Level Japanese Classes. *Japanese Learning and Research*, 182, 86-91.

Zhou, Y. S. (2013). A Comparative Study of Teacher Feedback, Peer Feedback and Online Feedback in English Writing. *Foreign Language World*, 3, 87-96.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET

ÖĞRENCİLERİN E-GERİBİLDİRİM TÜRLERİNE İLİŞKİN TUTUMLARI VE ALGILARI: ÇEVRİMİÇİ ÖĞRETMEN GERİBİLDİRİMİ (ÇÖG), ÇEVRİMİÇİ AKRAN GERİBİLDİRİMİ (ÇAG) VE OTOMATİK YAZI DEĞERLENDİRME GERİBİLDİRİMİ (OYDG)

1. GİRİŞ

Türkiye'de İngilizce hala yabancı bir dil olarak kabul edilirken, yazma becerisi öğrenenler için geç bir dönemde karmaşık bir yetenek olarak gelişir. Yazma, üretken becerilerden biri olarak kabul edilir ve yazma geri bildirimi konusunda farklı görüşler bulunmaktadır. Bazı araştırmacılar öğretmen geri bildiriminin yazma gelişimindeki önemini vurgularken, diğerleri etkililik ve açıklık konusundaki endişelerini dile getirirler. Akran geri bildirimi, işbirliğine dayalı öğrenmeyi ve eleştirel düşünme becerilerini teşvik ederken, öğrenciler akranlarının geri bildirim güvenilirliğini sorguladığında zorluklar ortaya çıkar. Örneğin, Armstrong (2010) dil becerilerinin gelişimi için çeşitli faktörleri tartışarak düzeltmeli geri bildirim verme ile öğrenci yazılı performansı arasındaki ilişkiyi ele almıştır. Bazı çalışmalar öğretmen geri bildiriminin yazma becerilerini artırdığını vurgularken (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010), diğerleri öğrenci geri bildiriminin de önemli bir rol oynadığını belirtmiştir (Hansen & Liu, 2005; Wihastyanang et al., 2020). Dijital ortamda geri bildirimin etkileri de araştırılmıştır (Ab Hamid, H., & Romly, R., 2020; AbuSa'aleek, A. O., & Shariq, M., 2021). Arslan (2013) öğretmen ve akran geri bildiriminin bloglar ve portföyler aracılığıyla nasıl entegre edilebileceğini tartışmıştır. Ayrıca, otomatik yazı değerlendirme geribildirimi (OYDG) etkisi de ele alınmıştır (Li et al., 2015; Luo & Liu, 2017). OYDG 'nin kişiselleştirilmiş yorumlar ve dilbilgisi hatalarının düzeltilmesine nasıl yardımcı olabileceği belirtilmiştir. Ancak OYDG 'nin mekanik, hatalı ve tekrarlayıcı görünebileceği ve öğrencilerin böyle bir geri bildirimi kabul etmesini zorlaştırabileceği de belirtilmiştir (Wei, 2015; Morch et al., 2017).

Bu araştırma, İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin çevrimiçi öğretmen geribildirimi (ÇÖG), çevrimiçi akran geribildirimi (ÇAG) ve otomatik yazı değerlendirme geribildirimi (OYDG) formlarına yönelik görüşlerini, deneyimlerini ve bu elektronik geri bildirim türlerinin İngilizce yazma yeteneklerine etkisini incelemektedir. 1. sınıfta İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilere odaklanan araştırmada, metin taslaklarına ve son hallerine geri bildirim verilmiştir. Bulgular, ÇÖG, ÇAG ve OYDG gibi e-geri bildirim türlerinin farklı yazma bağlamlarında öğrencilerin yazma yeteneklerini olumlu şekilde etkilediğini göstermiş, öğrencilerin bu geri bildirimleri değerli bulduğunu ve yazma becerilerini geliştirmedeki önemini anladığını göstermiştir. Bu sonuçlar, eğitimciler ve müfredat tasarımcıları için önemlidir, çünkü etkili geri bildirim stratejileri tasarlanırken öğrenci tercihlerinin ve öğrenme stillerinin dikkate alınması gerektiğini vurgular. Ayrıca, araştırma geri bildirimin öğrenme

sürecindeki kritik rolünü vurgulayarak, öğrenme ve gelişme için geri bildirimin ne kadar değerli olduğunu gösterir. Geri bildirim, yalnızca hataları tespit etmekle kalmaz, aynı zamanda yazma becerilerini motive edici bir araç olarak geliştirmede önemli bir rol oynar. Bu da geri bildirimin öğrenci katılımını artırma ve yazma yeteneklerini geliştirme temel rolünü öne çıkarır. Bununla birlikte, araştırma zamanında geri bildirim iletiminin önemini de vurgulayarak, eğitimcilerin etkili öğrenmeyi ve öğrenci gelişimini kolaylaştırmak için zamanında geri bildirim sağlamaya öncelik vermesi gerektiğini belirtir.

Bu bilgiler ışığında, bu çalışmada aşağıdaki soruların cevapları aranmıştır:

1. İngilizce yazma bağlamında yeni başlayan İngilizce öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin elektronik geri bildirim türlerine (ÇÖG, ÇAG ve OYDG) karşı tutumları ve tercihleri nedir?

2. Elektronik geri bildirimin farklı kaynaklarının (ÇÖG, ÇAG ve OYDG) yeni başlayan İngilizce öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin yazma performansı üzerindeki etkisi nedir ve nasıl bir gelişme sağlar?

2. YÖNTEM

Bu çalışmanın anket kısmına 65 öğrenci, yarı yapılandırılmış sözlü görüşmelere de 10 öğrenci katılmıştır. Katılımcılar, yaşları 18 ile 22 arasında İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümü öğrencileridir. Katılımcılar İngilizce paragraf ve deneme yazma becerilerini Yazma Becerileri 1 ve 2 dersleri kapsamında almışlardır. Araştırmacılar, aynı üniversitede öğretim üyesi olarak görüşmeleri ve gözlemleri gerçekleştirmişlerdir.

Çalışmada katılımcıların taslak yazma ve e-geribildirim türleri hakkındaki görüşlerini soran 20 açık uçlu sorudan oluşan bir anket kullanılmıştır. Kapsamlı inceleme için ayrıca sözlü görüşmeler gerçekleştirilmiştir. Katılımcıların anket cevapları ve görüşmeleri temalar ve desenler açısından incelenmiştir. *Üçgenleme,* gözlemleri, yazı örneklerini ve anket verilerini birleştirerek kullanılmıştır. *Üye kontrolü* inandırıcılığı arttırmış, katılımcılar bulunanların doğruluğunu onaylamıştır. Veri toplama işlemi iki eğitim-öğretim dönemi sürmüştür.

Taslak yazı süreci, teorik eğitimi, örnek analizini, fikir oluşturmayı ve geri bildirimin entegrasyonunu içermekteydi. Öğrenciler ilk taslakları yazarken uygulamalar yapmışlar ve geri bildirimi öğretmenlerden, akranlarından ve otomatik araçlardan almışlardır. Akran geri bildiriminin ardından öğrenciler son taslakları üzerinde düzeltmeler yaparak teslim etmişler ve e-geribildirimin entegrasyonunu ve genel gelişmeyi değerlendirmişlerdir. Süreç yazma farkındalığı arttırmış, içerik ve organizasyonu iyileştirmiştir.

3. SONUÇ VE TARTIŞMA

Bu çalışma, öğrencilerin farklı türdeki e-geribildirim sağlayıcılarına yönelik algılarını ve tercihlerini, geribildirimin teslim zamanlamasını ve geribildirim stillerinin yazma becerilerine etkisini incelemek amacıyla yürütülmüştür. Bulgular, e-geribildirimin öğrenme sürecindeki önemini

vurgulamakta ve etkili geribildirim stratejileri tasarlarken bireysel tercihleri dikkate alma gerekliliğini vurgulamaktadır.

Bulgular farklı e-geribildirim sağlayıcılarına ilişkin öğrenci tercihleriyle ilgili aşağıdaki gibi bir dizi tema ve kategoriyi tanımlamıştır:

Taslak Hazırlama Karşısında Yazma: Öğrencilerin taslak hazırlama sürecine karşı hızlı yazma tercihleri farklılık göstermiştir. Bazıları, düşünceleri düzenlemek ve dilbilgisini geliştirmek için taslak hazırlamanın faydalı olduğunu belirtirken, diğerleri hemen yazmaya başlamayı tercih etti.

Not Karşısında Geribildirim: Öğrencilerin çoğu, not yerine geribildirimi önemsedi ve geribildirimin hataları düzeltmelerine ve becerilerini geliştirmelerine yardımcı olduğunu söyledi. Notlar akademik ilerlemeleri için önemli olarak görülse de, geribildirimin öğrenme ve gelişme için kritik bir rol oynadığı belirlendi.

Gelecekte Çevrimiçi Geribildirim Sağlayıcılarını Kullanma İstekliliği: Katılımcılar, e-geribildirim platformlarının kullanımını gelecekte tekrar istemeye olumlu bir yaklaşım sergilediler. Bu tercihin arkasında, bu tür platformların hataları tespit etmede sağladığı kolaylık ve etkinliğin bulunması yer aldı. Bununla birlikte, güvenilirlik ve etkinlik konularında endişeler de dile getirildi.

E-Geribildirim Sağlayıcılarına İlişkin Tercihler ve Memnuniyet: Öğretmenler tarafından sunulan e-geribildirim ayrıntı ve kişiselleştirilmiş yaklaşımı nedeniyle takdir edildi. E-akran geribildirimi hataları tespit etmede yardımcı olurken, öğretmen uzmanlığının eksik görüldüğü belirtildi. Otomatik e-geribildirim sağlayıcıları, hızlı ve kesin sonuçları nedeniyle övgü aldı.

Yazılı E-Geribildirim Zamanlaması: Öğrenciler geribildirimi ne zaman almayı tercih ettikleri konusunda çeşitli görüşlere sahipti; bazıları sınavdan önce isterken, diğerleri görevlerini tamamladıktan sonra tercih etti.

Geleneksel, Çevrimiçi ve Sözlü Geribildirim Karşılaştırması: Öğrencilerin çoğu, erişilebilirlik ve kullanılabilirlik nedeniyle yazılı e-geribildirimi tercih etti. Ancak bazıları özellikle daha büyük ödevler için sözlü geribildirimi tercih etti.

Alınan Farklı Geribildirim Türlerini Anlama: Öğrenciler, öğretmen geribildirimi ve OYDG'yi anlamada kolaylık yaşarken, e-akran geribildiriminin zaman zaman karmaşık olduğunu ifade etti.

E-Geribildirim Uzunluğunun Etkisi: Öğrenciler, kapsamlı ve ayrıntılı e-geribildirimi tercih ettiler. Bu tür geribildirimin bütünsel hata düzeltme ve pedagojik gelişim sağlama kapasitesine değer verdiler.

Gelecekte Çevrimiçi Geribildirim Sağlayıcılarını Kullanma İstekliliği: Katılımcıların çoğunluğu, e-geribildirim platformlarını tekrar kullanmaya hazır olduklarını ifade ettiler; ancak bazıları diğer geribildirim türlerini tercih etti.

Sonuç olarak, bu çalışmada, e-geribildirimin öğrenme sürecindeki önemi vurgulanırken, öğrenci tercihlerinin e-geribildirim sağlayıcılarına ilişkin çeşitli faktörlere dayandığı belirtiliyor. Ayrıca eğitimcilerin yazma eğitimini geliştirmek ve etkili öğrenme sonuçları elde etmek için anlamlı ve zamanında geribildirim kullanmaları gerektiğine dikkat çekiliyor. Araştırmada, sınırlamalar da kabul

edilerek küçük örneklem boyutu ve uzun dönem veri eksikliği gibi konulara da değiniliyor. Gelecekteki araştırmaların bireysel geribildirim tercihlerini, farklı geribildirim stillerinin etkililiğini ve eğitmen eğitiminin geribildirim sağlama etkinliğine etkisini incelemeyi içerebileceği öneriliyor.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çevrimiçi eğitim; çevrimiçi öğretmen geribildirimi; çevrimiçi akran geribildirimi; otomatik yazı değerlendirme geribildirimi; İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak yazma